

**To:** Goldmann, Elizabeth[Goldmann.Elizabeth@epa.gov]  
**From:** Leidy, Robert  
**Sent:** Fri 10/6/2017 3:30:34 AM  
**Subject:** Fw: SPL-2003-00826-Vigneto

fysa

---

**From:** Kepner, William  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 5, 2017 8:20 PM  
**To:** Leidy, Robert  
**Subject:** FW: SPL-2003-00826-Vigneto

Rob:

Forgot reply to all. Funny how things go around. Thought this was all solved years ago.

Bill

---

**From:** Kepner, William  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 5, 2017 8:19 PM  
**To:** Tricia Gerrodette  
**Subject:** RE: SPL-2003-00826-Vigneto

Yes, but that could easily be challenged. I'm sure others might be working in background, e.g. Center for Biodiversity. Likely ACOE went for FONSI (Finding of No Significant Impact) on the EA. Could be contest not so much because of the Jaguar (Section 7 of ESA) but more related to water supply and discharge (CWA Sec. 404). Probably hasn't made the headlines in Tucson yet but likely to get attention. Let me know.

---

**From:** Tricia Gerrodette **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 5, 2017 6:08 PM  
**To:** Leidy, Robert; Kepner, William  
**Subject:** Fwd: SPL-2003-00826-Vigneto

I keep being reminded that no EIS was done on this project more than a decade ago, only an EA. And that was for "just" 8000 acres. It's now more than 12,000 acres, there is now critical habitat for jaguars in the area, and the Corps is saying that their first glance indicates this proposal is not going to require an EIS.

<http://www.spl.usace.army.mil/Portals/17/Users/032/24/1824/SPL-2003-00826-Vigneto-PN.pdf?ver=2017-10-04-181425-427>

--

Light travels faster than sound. This is why some people appear bright until you hear them speak. – from a FB posting